

increase, it is because for the first time it won't be wide open spending.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, Senator Hefner, then Senator Schmit. Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I call the question.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Two are excused. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 8 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate has ceased. Senator Vard Johnson will close, please. Just a minute, Senator Vard. (Gavel.)

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature...

SPEAKER NICHOL: Just a moment, please. (Gavel.) We still don't have all of our attention. Thank you.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, my motion is very simple. It is not a motion, it is not a motion to amend LB 126 with a repealer of the financing provisions in 662. My motion is simply to suspend the rules so that we can discuss whether or not the financing aspect of 662 should be repealed through an amendment to 126. So it is important that you simply focus in on whether the rules should be suspended to permit the debate and the action. Now the greatest argument against suspending the rules, as far as I can tell, is that it simply... a rule suspension simply delays our other work that we have ahead of us. That is correct. It does delay it, just like resolutions delay the work that we have ahead of us, just like a variety of other legislative business delays the work that we have ahead of us. I don't worry so much about the delay that is naturally inherent in discussing an issue. The issue, if it is worthy of discussion, should be discussed. I think this is an issue which is worthy of discussion. All I am asking is that we suspend the rules to allow the financing language of 662 to be discussed and, if there are 25 people who want to repeal that financing language, for them to be able to reflect their will. If